



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,818	12/31/2001	Robert L. Popp	KCC 4771	9058
321	7590	04/19/2006	EXAMINER	
SENNIGER POWERS ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE 16TH FLOOR ST LOUIS, MO 63102				REICHLE, KARIN M
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3761	

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

**MAILED**

Application Number: 10/038,818  
Filing Date: December 31, 2001  
Appellant(s): POPP ET AL.

**APR 19 2006**

**GROUP 3700**

---

Kurt F. James  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 2-3-06 appealing from the Office action mailed 7-21-05.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The following are the related appeals, interferences, and judicial proceedings known to the examiner which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal:

According to a statement by the same real party in interest as set forth supra filed in 10/038,796, the appeal in the instant application is related to the appeals in 10/038,796 and 10/159,076.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is substantially correct. The changes are as follows: Ground B also applies to claims 3 and 20 which depend from claim 19, i.e. B. Appellant further appeals the rejection of claims 3, 19-20 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,883,028 (Morman

Art Unit: 3761

'028), and thereby U.S. Patent Nos. 5,116,662 (Morman '662) and 5,114,781 (Morman '781), in view of Hetzler. Note page 15, second full paragraph of the Brief.

### **GROUNDS OF REJECTION NOT ON REVIEW**

The following grounds of rejection have not been withdrawn by the examiner, but they are not under review on appeal because they have not been presented for review in the appellant's brief. 1) The rejection of claims 3 and 20 under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Hetzler et al '136.

2) The rejection of claims 21-23 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hetzler '136 in view of Robertson '140 or Morman et al '028, and thereby Morman '781 and '662, in view of Hetzler '136 and Robertson '140.

### **(7) Claims Appendix**

A substantially correct copy of the appealed claims appears on page 15 of the Appendix to the appellant's brief. The minor errors are as follows: in light of Appellant's remarks on the cover letter of the instant brief, it is unclear whether claims 3 and 20-23 should also be set forth. Therefore an appendix which includes such claims is attached to this Answer and the Appendix which is proper, i.e. either that attached to the Brief or that attached to the Answer, can be consulted.

### **(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

5,910,136	HETZLER et al.	6-1999
5,883,028	MORMAN et al.	3-1999
5,114,781	MORMAN	5-1992
5,116,662	MORMAN	5-1992

### **(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

#### *Claim Language Interpretation*

“Neck-stretched” is defined as set forth on page 9, lines 1-3. The terminology “attached” is interpreted in view of the definition bridging pages 5-6, i.e. could be direct or indirect attachment. With regard to the claims, it is noted that it is not claimed how the component is mounted on the article or how stretchable the loop component is, i.e. the specific amount of limited movement, relative to the hook component after such mounting

Ground A.:

Claims 19 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hetzler ‘136.

See definitions supra, col. 10, line 65-col. 12, line 2 and Figure 3, i.e. teaches a mechanical fastening system 88 for an article 80 with a loop fastening component and a hook component, see elements 10 and 30 in Figure 2, col. 7, lines 20-36, col. 9, lines 54-56, col. 8, lines 34-39 and col. 9, lines 1-3 and 26-36, i.e. the loop component is a neck stretched, i.e. prestrained, nonwoven material directly attached to an elastic substrate and the component and elastic are capable of stretching in multiple directions, i.e. the CD and MD directions. The whereby clause recites properties, functions or capabilities of the claimed structure. As discussed supra, the ‘136 reference includes all the claimed structure. Therefore there is sufficient factual evidence for one to conclude that the claimed properties, functions and capabilities would also be inherent in the same structure of the ‘136 device. See MPEP 2112.01. With regard to the specific stretching capability limitations of claim 19 and claim 25, see again

Art Unit: 3761

col. 7, lines 20-36, i.e. at least about 150 percent, i.e. at least about 2.5 times a relaxed length. It is noted that lines 22-27 discuss the stretched biased length to the relaxed unbiased length, i.e. at least about 150%, whereas lines 31-36 discuss the stretch with regard to a percentage of the relaxed length, e.g. 100% or more, i.e. in other words, the stretched biased length to the unbiased length is 2.0 times or more. Attention is also invited to the paragraphs bridging pages 31-32 and 35-36 and page 36, line 20-page 37, line 13 of the instant application.

Ground B:

Claims 3, 19-20 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morman et al '028, and thereby Morman '781 and '662, in view of Hetzler '136.

With regard to claims 19, 25, 20 and 3, see col. 1, lines 5-7, col. 2, lines 6-8, and 10-13, col. 4, lines 11-13, col. 8, lines 27-35, col. 9, lines 58-66 and col. 11, line 65-col.12, line 16, of '028 and thereby Morman '662 at col. 11, line 40-col. 12, line 34 and Morman '781 at col. 13, line 41- col. 14, line 61 (compare to page 29, lines 28-30, page 32, lines 7-15 and page 36, line 20-page 37, line 25 of the instant specification), i.e. a neck stretched or prestrained material 12 is directly attached to an elastic substrate which is stretchable in two directions to form a laminate which is capable of elastic stretch in two directions and the material 12 is necked in the cross direction of the laminate and is attached to the elastic substrate as claimed in claim 3. The laminate so formed can be used as a breathable elastic film and nonwoven laminate outer cover of a diaper. With regard to the specific stretching capability limitations of claim 19 and claim 25, see, e.g., col. 2, lines 58-63, i.e. at least about 160 percent, i.e. at least 2.5 times the relaxed length. Therefore, the Morman '028 device includes all the claimed structure except for such

Art Unit: 3761

laminate being used as a loop component of a mechanical fastening system for an article which system also includes a hook component. However, Hetzler '136 also teaches a breathable, elastic film and nonwoven laminate can not only be used as the outer cover of a diaper but also as a loop component of a hook and loop mechanical fastener system in a diaper, see col. 10, line 65-col. 12, line 2 as well as the other portions of the '136 reference cited supra. To use the breathable, elastic film and nonwoven laminate of Morman '028, and thereby '662 and '718, to not only to form the outer cover but also form a loop component of a mechanical fastening system would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the interchangability as taught by Hetzler, e.g. col. 10, line 65-col. 12, line 2, i.e. outer cover laminate/loop type fastener combination interchangeable with outer cover laminate which also serves as the loop fastener. With regard to the whereby clauses of claim 19, if not already taught by the prior art combination, the prior art combination would necessarily and inevitably possess the same functions, capabilities and properties because it includes the same materials processed in the same manner as the claimed invention, see cited portions of references and the instant application supra.

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

Ground A.:

Claim 19:

Appellant's discussion of claim 19 on pages 9-11 is noted. Attention is directed to claim 19 in the Appendix and the Claim Language Interpretation section supra.

The remainder of Appellant's arguments on pages 11-15 have been considered but are deemed not persuasive. Attention is also directed to page 18, lines 7-8 of the Brief. Specifically, Appellant's argue Hetzler fails to show or suggest 1) a mechanical fastening system including a loop component that is mountable on an article, 2) capable of elastic stretching in at least two directions, 3) elastically stretchable to at least 2.0 times a relaxed length in at least one of the directions, and 4) constructed of a neck-stretched non-woven material attached directly to an elastic substrate. However the portions of the Hetzler reference cited supra, see Section (9), Ground A., i.e. 1) col. 10, line 65-col. 12, line 2, 2) col. 9, lines 26-27, i.e. both CD and MD, 3) col. 7, lines 20-36, note especially "at least" and "or more", and 4) col. 8, lines 34-39, col. 9, lines 1-3 and 54-55, teach the claimed features. Further attention is also directed to Table II, e.g. samples A and H, Peak Elongation %, and col. 13, lines 28-35. Therefore, Appellant's arguments are deemed narrower than the teachings of the prior art to Hetzler.

Claim 25:

See again, e.g., col. 7, lines 20-36 and the discussion of the arguments with respect to claim 19 supra.

The rejection of claims 19 and 25 is deemed proper and maintained.

Ground B:

Claims 3 and 19-23:

Appellant's remarks on pages 16-19 of the Brief have been considered but are deemed not persuasive. Specifically, Appellant argues that it would not be obvious in view of Hetzler to use the laminate of Morman as a loop component because neither Morman or Hetzler 1) have

Art Unit: 3761

anything to do with mechanical fastening systems, see page 17, second full paragraph of the Brief, nor 2) teach a loop component that is able to elastically stretch 2.0 times its relaxed length. First it is noted that the argument on page 18, second full paragraph is not only inconsistent with the prior art rejection *supra* but Appellant's own statement of the Office's position at page 16, lines 9-13 and *supra*, i.e. the Office's position is not that the loop fastener of Hetzler is replaced with the laminate of Morman. With regard to 1), see not only the discussion of the Hetzler and Morman in Section (9), Ground B. and Section (10), Ground A., *supra* but also page 18, lines 7-8 of the Brief, i.e. Hetzler explicitly teaches a loop component. (It is noted that the Office's position never alleged that the Morman reference explicitly taught a loop component, i.e. this is the reason why the rejection is made under 35 USC 103(a) rather than 35 USC 102(b).) With regard to 2) see not only the discussion of the Hetzler and Morman in Section (9), Ground B. and Section (10), Ground A., but note the language "at least" and "or more" with regard to the portions of the references describing the elastic stretch capability. Therefore Appellant's arguments are deemed narrower than the teachings of the prior art.

Claim 25:

See again, e.g., the cited portions of Morman '028 and the discussion of the arguments with respect to claim 19 *supra*.

The rejection of claims 3, 19-23 and 25 are deemed proper and maintained.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

K. M. Reichle

*K.M. Reichle*

Conferees:

Tanya Zalukaeva

*Tanya*

Angela Sykes

*Angela Sykes*